



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

90  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/587,403

06/05/2000

Robert D Gardos

81866.A

9935

26021

7590

11/01/2006

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.  
1999 AVENUE OF THE STARS  
SUITE 1400  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER

TRUONG, THANHNGA B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2135

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/587,403

Applicant(s)

GARDOS ET AL.

Examiner

Thanhnga B. Truong

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/16/06 (RCE).
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 June 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

*Thanhnga B. Truong*  
AU 2135

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 16, 2006 has been entered. Claims 1-20 are pending. At this time, claims 1-20 are rejected.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 1 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities:

a. *Referring to claim 1:*

Applicant added a new limitation in the first part of claim 1, which is "the domain management systems allowing an authorized agent to change information about the active domain name in the shared registry system". This limitation has caused the first part of limitation becoming a "run-on" sentence. A connection word or a transition word is needed to avoid "run-on" sentence. Appropriate correction is required.

b. *Referring to claim 7:*

Applicant added a new limitation in the last part of claim 7, which is "the domain management systems causing the zone file with the changed information about the active domain name to update the shared registry system". This limitation has caused the last part of limitation becoming a "run-on" sentence. A connection word or a transition word is needed to avoid "run-on" sentence. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

Art Unit: 2135

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. Referring to claim 1:

Applicant is using language like "allowing an authorized agent to change" in the first paragraph of claim 1. These words like "allowing", "permitting", or "causing" a computer to do something. Recognize that all these claims require is that a reference does not prohibit a computer from doing the recited acts. They do not cause any functionality to occur in the computer. It's unclear what Applicant's intended metes and bounds of the claim are, since the claim appears to cover anything and everything that does not prohibit actions from occurring, and absent recitation of any code or steps for causing a computer to do anything, instead just ensuring there's no code or steps which prohibit it, there does not appear to be a useful, concrete and tangible result. Appropriate correction is required.

b. Referring to claim 7:

Applicant is using language like "causing a change" or "causing the zone file with the change" in the last paragraph of claim 7. These words like "allowing", "permitting", or "causing" a computer to do something. Recognize that all these claims require is that a reference does not prohibit a computer from doing the recited acts. They do not cause any functionality to occur in the computer. It's unclear what Applicant's intended metes and bounds of the claim are, since the claim appears to cover anything and everything that does not prohibit actions from occurring, and absent recitation of any code or steps for causing a computer to do anything, instead just ensuring there's no code or steps which prohibit it, there does not appear to be a useful, concrete and tangible result. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2135

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waters (US 6, 564, 216), and further in view of InterNIC: Updating the domain name and associated records.

a. Referring to claim 1:

i. Waters teaches:

(1) domain name identifier coupled to receive input from an agent accessing the domain management system, the agent acting on behalf of a registrant of an active domain name, the domain name identifier generating a request for and accepting identification of a domain name to be the active domain name, the domain management systems allowing an authorized agent to change information about the active domain name in the shared registry system **[i.e., after logging in with the server manager 201, each DNS server 202A-N and DHCP server 203A-N must set their server-id, step 306. Each server-id is checked against all of the DNS and DHCP servers already coupled in communication with the server manager 201, step 307. If the server-id is the same as a server-id for a server already on the network, the TCP link for the requesting server will be dropped, step 308. If the server-id is unique to that server, the login process is complete, step 309 (column 5, lines 19-58). In addition, in order to add host information to the central database 204, the server manager 201 must determine if the domain name is available, unavailable, moving from another host or being updated (column 7, line 16-19). Furthermore, Figures 5 and 6 of Waters shows the domain management systems allowing an authorized agent to change information about the active domain name in the shared registry system. This limitation is further met on column 7, lines 64-67 through column 8, lines 1-14 of Waters];**

(2) an authorization checker responsive to an input from the agent to check whether an administrative contact for the active domain name has

identified to the domain management system that the agent is authorized to change information about the active domain name in the shared registry system and, if the agent lacks authority to change information about the active domain name in the shared registry system, the authorization checker generating a communication to the administrative contract to determine if the agent should be given authority to change information about the active domain name in the shared registry system [i.e., in order to add host information to the central database 204, the server manager 201 must determine if the domain name is available, unavailable, moving from another host or being updated. Upon receiving a request from a DHCP server 203A to add a host, the server manager 201 first checks if the domain is a Canonical Name (CNAME) or primary name. If the domain is a CNAME, it fails validation and the server manager 201 notifies the DHCP server 203A that the domain is unavailable.<sup>sup.11</sup> If the domain does not exist in the central database 204, the label.<sup>sup.12</sup> may be assigned to the host and the server manager 201 notifies the DHCP server 203A that the domain is available (column 7, line 16-29)]; and

(3) an information change engine responsive to a request from the agent to change information about the active domain name, the information change engine generating an information change request that changes the information about the active domain name in the shared registry system in response to the request from the agent [i.e., The server manager 201 synchronizes all of the requests and updates from the servers and transmits them to the central database 204. The server manager 201 monitors all the DNS servers 202A-N and DHCP servers 203A-N on the network from a single point and acts as a single pipeline to the central database 204. For example, when a new client 208 sends a request for an IP address to a DHCP server 203A, the DHCP server 203A determines if it can send configuration information to the requesting client 208. If the DHCP server 203A can give an IP address and configuration information to the client 208, it sends host configuration information and an IP address to the client 208. The DHCP server 203A automatically registers the new domain name, the IP address and the host configuration information with the central database 204 through the

Art Unit: 2135

server manager 201. The DNS server 202A detects the new IP address through the server manager and updates its DNS information. When the lease expires or the client 208 leaves the network and releases the IP address, the DHCP server 203A notifies the central database 204 of the change through the server manager 201. The IP address is available for reassignment by the DHCP server 203A to a new client. Therefore, the server manager 201 eliminates the need for the individual DNS servers 202A-N and DHCP servers 203A-N to establish direct communication channels with the central database by providing access to the central database 204 through one communication channel 206 (column 5, lines 32-59). Also, referring to Figure 2, note that a number of DNS servers and DHCP servers share a common central database. Furthermore, note that client can go through a binding server or the DNS/DHCP servers to get to the server manager which then can go to the share register (configuration database)];

ii. Although Waters does not clearly state the role for authorizing the domain name to be changed and/or altered from the server manager 201 as in Figure 2, Waters implies:

(1) The server manager would communicate directly with the plurality of servers and the central database and transmit any requests from the servers to the central database. Therefore, the central database only would need to communicate with the server manager. All configuration changes (i.e., such as domain name), whether made statically, dynamically or at remote locations, are registered in the central database and automatically distributed to the appropriate servers (**column 3, lines 8-45 of Water**).

iii. On the other hand, InterNIC teaches:

(1) Updating the domain name and associated records, whether to replace an existing contract with a new contract, or to change information about the organization, or to change name servers – Domain Name Registration Agreement is modified and sent to InterNIC. Once the InterNIC receives the modification request, the tracking number is assigned and an acknowledgement is sent to the individual who submitted the request via e-mail (see page 3 of Updating the

Art Unit: 2135

domain name and associated records). Furthermore, InterNIC teaches checking to see where the request came from (see page 1 of InterNIC).

iv. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) clearly state the role of authorization of the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to provide an improved means of communicating between a database and one or more servers. **(column 2, lines 7-9 of Waters).**

v. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) clearly state the role of authorization of the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to manage IP addressing in a network and effectively synchronize communication between a central database and one or more servers (such as DNS and DHCP) **(column 2, lines 12-15 of Waters).**

b. Referring to claim 2:

i. This claim has some limitations that is similar to those of claim 1, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

c. Referring to claim 3:

i. Although Waters does not clearly state the role for generating a confirmation message from the server manager 201 as in Figure 2, Waters implies:

(1) The server manager would communicate directly with the plurality of servers and the central database and transmit any requests from the servers to the central database. Therefore, the central database only would need to communicate with the server manager. All configuration changes (i.e., such as domain name), whether made statically, dynamically or at remote locations, are registered in the central database and automatically distributed to the appropriate servers **(column 3, lines 8-45 of Water).**

ii. On the other hand, InterNIC teaches:

(1) Updating the domain name and associated records, whether to replace an existing contact with a new contract, or to change information about the organization, or to change name servers – Domain Name Registration



Art Unit: 2135

Agreement is modified and sent to InterNIC. Once the InterNIC receives the modification request, the tracking number is assigned and an acknowledgement is sent to the individual who submitted the request via e-mail (see page 3 of Updating the domain name and associated records).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) clearly state the role for generating a confirmation message from the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to provide an improved means of communicating between a database and one or more servers. **(column 2, lines 7-9 of Waters).**

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) clearly state the role for generating a confirmation message from the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to manage IP addressing in a network and effectively synchronize communication between a central database and one or more servers (such as DNS and DHCP) **(column 2, lines 12-15 of Waters).**

d. Referring to claims 4-5:

i. Waters further teaches:

(1) wherein the information change engine resides on a server coupled to a second server capable of directly accessing a share registry system; and wherein the information change request is passed through the second server and to the shared registry system **[i.e., referring to Figure 2, note that a number of DNS servers and DHCP servers share a common central database. Furthermore, note that client can go through a binding server or the DNS/DHCP servers to get to the server manager which then can go to the share register (configuration database)].**

e. Referring to claims 6, 16:

i. Waters further teaches:

(1) wherein, in response to determining that the agent is authorized for the active domain name, the information change engine causes display of

Art Unit: 2135

a screen listing a plurality of functions for changing information within a zone file for the active domain name [i.e., referring again to Figure 2, note all updates or changes for all DNS's are recorded in the central database].

ii. Although Water teaches updating for all DNS, Water is silent on the capability for changing information within a zone file. On the other hand, InterNIC teaches:

(1) Information for the domain is updated in InterNIC's Whois database and released into the zone files (see page 7 and 8 of InterNIC).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) clearly state the role of authorization of the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to provide an improved means of communicating between a database and one or more servers. (**column 2, lines 7-9 of Waters**).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) clearly state the role of authorization of the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to manage IP addressing in a network and effectively synchronize communication between a central database and one or more servers (such as DNS and DHCP) (**column 2, lines 12-15 of Waters**).

f. Referring to claim 17:

i. Although Waters does not clearly state the role for authorizing the domain name to be changed and/or altered from the server manager 201 as in Figure 2, Waters implies:

(1) The server manager would communicate directly with the plurality of servers and the central database and transmit any requests from the servers to the central database. Therefore, the central database only would need to communicate with the server manager. All configuration changes (i.e., such as domain name), whether made statically, dynamically or at remote locations, are registered in the central database and automatically distributed to the appropriate servers (**column 3, lines 8-45**).

iii. On the other hand, InterNIC teaches:

(1) Updating the domain name and associated records, whether to replace an existing contact with a new contract, or to change information about the organization, or to change name servers – Domain Name Registration Agreement is modified and sent to InterNIC. Once the InterNIC receives the modification request, the tracking number is assigned and an acknowledgement is sent to the individual who submitted the request via e-mail (see page 3 of Updating the domain name and associated records)

iv. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) clearly state the role of authorization of the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to provide an improved means of communicating between a database and one or more servers. **(column 2, lines 7-9 of Waters).**

v. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) clearly state the role of authorization of the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to manage IP addressing in a network and effectively synchronize communication between a central database and one or more servers (such as DNS and DHCP) **(column 2, lines 12-15 of Waters).**

g. Referring to claim 7:

i. Waters teaches:

(1) The limitation of generating messages to acknowledging authentication of party seeking access to the domain management system, identifying active domain and issuing update requests is disclosed by Waters **(column 9, lines 5-18)**. Note this can include a graphics interface for user, or electronic message for updating the central database, validating user, or polling devices. Claim 7 is rejected.

ii. Although Waters does not clearly state the role for authorizing the domain name to be changed and/or altered, as well as generating a confirmation message from the server manager 201 as in Figure 2, Waters implies:

(1) The server manager would communicate directly with the plurality of servers and the central database and transmit any requests from the

Art Unit: 2135

servers to the central database. Therefore, the central database only would need to communicate with the server manager. All configuration changes (i.e., such as domain name), whether made statically, dynamically or at remote locations, are registered in the central database and automatically distributed to the appropriate servers (**column 3, lines 8-45**).

iii. On the other hand, InterNIC teaches:

(1) Updating the domain name and associated records, whether to replace an existing contact with a new contract, or to change information about the organization, or to change name servers – Domain Name Registration Agreement is modified and sent to InterNIC. Once the InterNIC receives the modification request, the tracking number is assigned and an acknowledgement is sent to the individual who submitted the request via e-mail (see page 3 of Updating the domain name and associated records). Furthermore, InterNIC teaches checking to see where the request came from (see page 1 of InterNIC).

iv. Water is also silent on the capability for changing information within a zone file. On the other hand, InterNIC teaches:

(1) Information for the domain is updated in InterNIC's Whois database and released into the zone files (see page 7 and 8 of InterNIC).

v. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) clearly state the role of authorization of the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to provide an improved means of communicating between a database and one or more servers (**column 2, lines 7-9 of Waters**).

vi. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) clearly state the role of authorization of the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to manage IP addressing in a network and effectively synchronize communication between a central database and one or more servers (such as DNS and DHCP) (**column 2, lines 12-15 of Waters**).

h. Referring to claim 8:

i. Waters further teaches:

(1) The limitation of a diagnostic utility engine (troubleshooter software) is disclosed by Water (**column 9, lines 9-15 of Waters**). The operating system continually checks and analyzes the status of the system through electronic communication messages. Claim 8 is rejected.

i. Referring to claims 9-11:

i. Waters further teaches:

(1) The limitation that the diagnostic utility performs troubleshooting on all parts of the system and report to the network administrator is disclosed by Waters (**column 9, lines 5-35 of Waters**). Claims 9-11 are rejected.

j. Referring to claim 12:

i. Waters further teaches:

(1) The limitation that the update engine resides on the accredited registrar (delta-logging facility in the central database) is disclosed by Waters (**column 8, lines 23-24 of Waters**). Claim 12 is rejected.

k. Referring to claims 13-15:

i. Waters further teaches:

(1) The limitation that the update software can reside on a server that directly access a shared registry, or on a server directly connected to a second server, or passing through a second server connected to the shared registry is disclosed by Waters (**see Figure 2 of Waters**). Claims 13-15 are rejected.

l. Referring to claims 18-19:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 7, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 7 above.

m. Referring to claim 20:

i. This claim has some limitations that is similar to those of claim 8, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 8 above.

### **Conclusion**

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2135

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

TBT

October 24, 2006

*Thanhnga B. Truong*  
AU 2135